

Serial No.: 09/729,394
Attorney Docket No.: F-223

Patent

REMARKS

Claims 1 -16 were currently pending in the Application. Applicants have canceled claim 11 without prejudice or disclaimer and reserve the right to pursue those or other claims in another application. Applicants have added new claims 17 and 18. Applicants have amended claims 1, 6 and 10. Applicants respectfully request entry of the above amendments and consideration of the enclosed remarks. Applicants submit that no new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1-10 and 12-18 will remain pending in the application.

In section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,909,373 to Sansone, et al. ("Sansone '373"). The Examiner has also included statements regarding claim 11 that are interpreted as a rejection.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 10 to recite that the rebate value is based on the postage refill amount. Applicants submit that a rebate based on the current postage refill amount is not inherent to the cited reference.

Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims of the same or other scope to the original claims in another application. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added and that the invention as presently claimed in claims 1 and 10 is patentable over the cited reference. Claim 11 has been canceled and the rejection is moot.

Claims 3, 4, 14 and 15, depend directly or indirectly from either claims 1 or 10 and are patentable for at least the reasons stated above with reference to claims 1 and 10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

In section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 2 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by Sansone '373 in view of apparent

Serial No.: 09/729,394
Attorney Docket No.: F-223

Patent

Official Notice of rebates paid by check. Applicants admit that rebates have been paid by check, but does not agree any proper combination renders the claims obvious. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and submit that the cited references do not alone or in proper combination render the invention as presently claimed in claims 2 and 13 obvious.

However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 10 and submit that claims 2 and 13 depend respectively from claims 1 and 10 and are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons stated above with reference to claims 1 and 10.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

In section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 5, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by Sansone '373 in view of an U.S. Patent No. 6,018,718 to Walker, et al. ("Walker '718"). The Examiner has also included statements regarding claims 9 and 12 that are interpreted as a rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and submit that the cited references do not alone or in proper combination render the invention as presently claimed in claims 5, 7, 8, 9 and 12 obvious.

However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 10 and submit that claims 5, 7, 8, 9 and 12 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 10 and are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons stated above with reference to claims 1 and 10.

Furthermore, with reference to claim 9, the cited references do not fairly teach or suggest receiving a user rebate delivery preference with the postage refill request.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Serial No.: 09/729,394
Attorney Docket No.: F-223

Patent

In section 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) apparently as allegedly rendered obvious by Sansone '373 in view of Walker '718 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,907,830 to Engel, et al. ("Engel '830").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and submit that the cited references do not alone or in proper combination render the invention as presently claimed in claim 6 obvious.

However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 6 and submit that claim 6 is patentable for at least the reasons stated above with reference to claim 1 and because the cited references do not fairly teach or suggested cryptographically securing the certificate as to sender and content. Engel '830 merely describes encrypting the recipient identification.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

In section 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by Sansone '373 in view of Walker '718 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,907,830 to Engel, et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and submit that the cited references do not alone or in proper combination render the invention as presently claimed in claim 16 obvious.

However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 10 and submit that claim 16 is patentable for at least the reasons stated above with reference to claim 10.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the invention as presently claimed in claims 1-16 is patentable over the cited references and in condition for allowance.

Serial No.: 09/729,394
Attorney Docket No.: F-223

Patent

CONCLUSION OF REMARKS

For at least the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the remaining claims of this application are in condition for allowance and early and favorable action thereon is requested.

If the Examiner believes that additional issues may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney for Applicant at (203) 924-3180.

AUTHORIZATION

No fee is believed due with this response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the response or credit any overpayment to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-223.

In the event that an extension of time or additional extension of time is required to make this response timely filed, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time that is required to make this response timely. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-223.

Respectfully submitted,



George M. Macdonald
Reg. No. 39,284
Attorney for Applicants
Telephone (203) 924-3180

PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive, P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000

Serial No.: 09/729,394
Attorney Docket No.: F-223

Patent

APPENDIX A
Version with Markings to Show Changes Made

In the claims:

Claims 1, 6 and 10 have been amended according to the marked up version shown below:

1. (Amended) A method for generating a rebate in a postage meter resetting system, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving a postage refill request at a postage data center to electronically add postage to a postage meter;
determining at the postage data center a rebate value associated with the postage refill request; and
sending the rebate value to a designated location,
wherein the rebate value is based on the postage refill amount.

6. (Amended) A method as recited in claim 5, further comprising cryptographically securing the certificate in order to authenticate the source of the rebate and verify that the certificate has not been modified.

10. (Amended) A data center for a postage meter resetting system, the data center comprising:

a computer that receives a postage refill request to electronically add a postage refill amount to a postage meter;
means for determining at the computer a rebate value associated with the postage refill request; and
means for sending the rebate value to a designated location, wherein the determining means determines the rebate value based on the postage refill amount.